



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,202	04/10/2006	Daisuke Kumaki	0553-0488	7114
26568	7590	04/03/2009	EXAMINER	
COOK ALEX LTD SUITE 2850 200 WEST ADAMS STREET CHICAGO, IL 60606			HO, ANTHONY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,202	Applicant(s) KUMAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner ANTHONY HO	Art Unit 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment to application no. 10/575,202 filed on January 14, 2009.

Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-14 stand withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-22, 26-28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Forrest et al (US Patent 5,703,436).

In re claim 15, Forrest et al discloses a light emitting device comprising: an anode (35) containing a light-transmitting material; a first layer (20E) containing a light-emitting material over the anode; a second layer (20T) containing an organic compound and an electron-supplying material; a third layer (middlemost 26I) including a transparent

Art Unit: 2815

conductive film over the second layer; and a fourth layer (21H or 22H) containing a hole transporting material over the third layer; and a cathode (topmost 26M) containing reflective metal over the fourth layer (i.e. Figure 2A; Figure 2B; column 4 - column 6).

In re claim 16, Forrest et al discloses a light emitting device comprising: an anode (38); a first layer (22E) containing a light-emitting material over the anode; a second layer (21T or 21E) containing an organic compound and an electron-supplying material over the first layer; a third layer (middlemost 26I) including a transparent conductive film over the second layer; and a fourth layer (20H) containing a hole transporting material over the third layer, the fourth layer being in contact (in this case, electrical contact or capacitive contact) with the third layer; and a cathode (topmost 26M) over the fourth layer, the cathode being in contact (in this case, electrical contact) with the fourth layer (i.e. Figure 2C; column 4 - column 6).

In re claim 17, Forrest et al discloses using one of the listed materials for the cathode (i.e. column 4).

In re claim 18, Forrest et al discloses using ITO for the transparent conductive film (i.e. column 4).

In re claims 19 and 20, Forrest et al discloses using metal complexes for the second layer (i.e. column 7).

In re claims 21 and 22, Forrest et al discloses using one of the listed metals for the organic compound (i.e. column 7, column 10).

In re claims 26-28, Forrest et al discloses using an organic compound for the hole transporting layer (i.e. column 10 - column 11).

In re claim 31, the recitation "wherein the electronic device is one selected from the group consisting of a television receiving machine, a personal computer, head mount display, a mobile phone and a video camera" in the claim specifies an intended use or field of use and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claim invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claim invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). A claim containing a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 23-25 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forrest et al (US Patent 5,703,436) as applied to claims 15 and 16 above, and further in view of Ishihara et al (US PUB 2003/0048072).

Ishihara et al discloses using materials such as molybdenum oxide and vanadium oxide for a hole-transport layer in an organic light emitting device (paragraph 0047).

The advantage is to have an appropriate level of ionization potential to lower the injection barriers in the light emitting device (paragraph 0047).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the light emitting device as taught by Forrest et al with using materials such as molybdenum oxide and vanadium oxide for a hole-transport layer in an organic light emitting device as taught by Ishihara et al in order to have an appropriate level of ionization potential to lower the injection barriers in the light emitting device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Forrest does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of "an anode containing a light-transmitting material," examiner asserts that Forrest does disclose the claimed feature of an anode (35) containing a light-

Art Unit: 2815

transmitting material (see Figure 2A and Figure 2B). Thus, the claimed invention is not patentably distinct over the organic semiconductor device of Forrest.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., in direct contact) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY HO whose telephone number is (571)270-1432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 10:30AM-9:00PM EST.

Art Unit: 2815

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2815

/Kenneth A Parker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2815